



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

United States Patent and Trademark Office

Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS

P.O. Box 1450

Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450

www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/787,226	02/27/2004	Ryan Mason	049051-0222	4844
31824 7590 03/17/2009 MCDERMOTT WILL & EMERY LLP 18191 VON KARMAN AVE. SUITE 500 IRVINE, CA 92612-7108				
EXAMINER				
BELANI, KISHIN G				
ART UNIT		PAPER NUMBER		
2443				
MAIL DATE		DELIVERY MODE		
03/17/2009		PAPER		

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/787,226

Applicant(s)

MASON ET AL.

Examiner

KISHIN G. BELANI

Art Unit

2443

Period for Reply -- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 22 December 2008.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1,3-7,9-12,17,19-21 and 23-32 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1,3-7,9-12,17,19-21 and 23-32 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
- 6) ☐ Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION

This action is in response to Applicant's amendment filed on 12/22/2008.

Independent claims 1, 7, 17 and 21 and dependent claims 26, 29 and 30 have been amended. Claims 2, 8, 13-16, 18 and 22 have been cancelled. Claims 1, 3-7, 9-13, 17, 19-21 and 23-32 are now pending in the present application. The applicants' amendments to claims are shown in *bold and italics*, and the examiner's response to claim amendments is shown in **bold in this office action. **This Action is made FINAL.****

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

The factual inquiries set forth in *Graham v. John Deere Co.*, 383 U.S. 1, 148 USPQ 459 (1966), that are applied for establishing a background for determining obviousness under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) are summarized as follows:

1. Determining the scope and contents of the prior art.
2. Ascertaining the differences between the prior art and the claims at issue.
3. Resolving the level of ordinary skill in the pertinent art.
4. Considering objective evidence present in the application indicating obviousness or nonobviousness.

This application currently names joint inventors. In considering patentability of the claims under 35 U.S.C. 103(a), the examiner presumes that the subject matter of the various claims was commonly owned at the time any inventions covered therein were made absent any evidence to the contrary. Applicant is advised of the obligation under 37 CFR 1.56 to point out the inventor and invention dates of each claim that was not commonly owned at the time a later invention was made in order for the examiner to consider the applicability of 35 U.S.C. 103(c) and potential 35 U.S.C. 102(e), (f) or (g) prior art under 35 U.S.C. 103(a).

Claims 1, 7, 17 and 21 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over **Falcon et al. (U.S. Patent Publication # 6,295,556 B1)** in view of **Coulthard et al. (U.S. Patent Application Publication # 2004/0003371 A1)** and further in view of **Handel et al. (U.S. Patent Publication # 7,076,504 B1)**.

Consider **claim 1**, Falcon et al. show and disclose a user interface for managing a connection between a remote computing device and a local computing device (Fig. 6 that shows a user interface for setting up network and Internet connections; Fig. 7 that shows a second interface to manage connections by setting different configuration options for a connection; column 2, lines 7-9 disclose the same details), comprising: a desktop **at the remote computing device**, wherein the desktop is operative to display at least a first connection icon directly on the desktop, the first connection icon representing a first connection between the remote computing device and a first local

Art Unit: 2443

computing device (Fig. 6 that shows a **window over** a desktop with a plurality of connection icons named "Office", "Work From Home" and "MSN" to select from, wherein each connection icon (under the "Connector Name" heading) represents a connection between a server (a first local computing device) and a client/user computer (the remote computing device); column 6, lines 29-43 describe the connection interface in more details),

wherein a user can either select the first connection icon or an active area on the desktop (Fig. 6 that further shows a "**New Connector**" active area on the desktop **window** to define a new connection or to select one of the previously defined connection (three of which are shown); column 6, lines 29-38 describe the same details),

wherein selecting the first connection icon allows a first connection represented by the first connection icon to become modifiable to alter the first connection (Fig. 7 that shows a user interface for receiving configuration information from a user for a selected connection (e.g. configuration information for the "Office" connection shown in Fig. 6); further showing different tabs that allow a user to modify the configuration settings of the selected connection; column 7, lines 1-27 disclose the details of the connection properties that may be modified for each one of the tabs shown in Fig. 7),

wherein selecting the active area allows a new connection window to appear (column 6, lines 34-38 which disclose using the "New Connection Wizard" by clicking on the active area labeled "New Connector" to initiate a new connection, then configuring it by supplying property values for the new connection object in Fig. 7) and, upon designating

a new connection, allows a second connection icon to be displayed directly on the desktop (Fig. 6 that shows three different connections on the desktop **window** that were created by the new connection wizard, then displayed as icons in the desktop **window**; column 6, lines 29-34 describe the same details), wherein the second connection icon represents a second connection different from the first connection, between the remote computing device and a second local computing device (Fig. 6 that shows a first connection "Office" icon, connecting a client's computer/workstation with the server on an office LAN, and a second connection "Work From Home" icon, connecting a client's computer/laptop at home with the server on the office LAN network).

However, Falcon et al. do not specifically disclose that the first connection icon is for a first application and the second connection icon is for a second application, wherein the first application is different from the second application; **and wherein the desktop is operative to display at least a first application icon directly on the desktop at the remote computing device, wherein the first application icon represents an application available for execution on the first local computing device.**

In the same field of endeavor, Coulthard et al. show and disclose the claimed user interface, wherein a first connection is for a first application and the second connection is for a second application, wherein the first application is different from the second application; **and wherein the desktop is operative to display at least a first application icon directly on the desktop at the remote computing device, wherein**

the first application icon represents an application available for execution on the first local computing device (Fig. 11, that shows three different connections 1111-1113 between a Developer 1 and three Remote Systems 1120, 1122 and 1124, wherein connection 1111 **(the first connection)** provides access to Tool A (application 1130) **to be executed on the “Remote System 1”, i.e. 1120 (corresponding to the first local computing device, a first server)** and connection 1112 **(the second connection)** provides access to Tool C (application 1150) **to be executed on the “Remote System 2”, i.e. 1122 (corresponding to the second local computing device, a second server)**; paragraph 0099 describes the same details).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to provide a user interface on a desktop, wherein a first connection is for a first application and the second connection is for a second application, and wherein the first application is different from the second application, and wherein the desktop is operative to display at least a first application icon directly on the desktop at the remote computing device, wherein the first application icon represents an application available for execution on the first local computing device, as taught by Coulthard et al., in the user interface of Falcon et al., so as to provide a user a graphical interface to set up and manage network connections based on the needed applications.

Although the combined references of Falcon et al. and Coulthard et al. disclose each and every element of claim 1; the applicants have argued that having a connection icon on a desktop is not equivalent to having a connection

icon in a window which is displayed on a desktop. Although dragging and dropping an icon from a displayed window to a desktop is a common and obvious technique in a Windows operating system, the examiner has included the additional reference of Handel et al. specifically to show that placing a connection icon on a desktop has indeed been previously disclosed, as described in column 30, lines 24-32 of the Handel et al. reference.

Consider **claim 7**, Falcon et al. show and disclose a method for managing a connection between a local computing device and a remote computing device using a user interface (Fig. 6 that shows a user interface for setting up network and Internet connections; Fig. 7 that shows a second interface to manage connections by setting different configuration options for a connection; column 2, lines 7-9 disclose the same details), comprising the steps of:

displaying a desktop **at the remote computing device** (Fig. 6 that displays a desktop with a user interface for setting up network and Internet connections **at the remote computing device**);

displaying at least a first connection icon directly on the desktop, the first connection icon representing a first connection between the remote computing device and a first local computing device (Fig. 6 that shows a **window over a** desktop with a plurality of connection icons named "Office", "Work From Home" and "MSN" to select from, wherein each connection icon (under the "Connector Name" heading) represents a connection between a server (a first local computing device) and a client/user computer (the remote

Art Unit: 2443

computing device); column 6, lines 29-43 describe the connection interface in more details);

receiving a user selection of the first connection icon, wherein the user selection of the first connection icon allows a first connection represented by the first connection icon to become modifiable to alter the first connection (Fig. 7 that shows a user interface for receiving configuration information from a user for a selected connection (e.g. configuration information for the "Office" connection shown in Fig. 6); further showing different tabs that allow a user to modify the configuration settings of the selected connection; column 7, lines 1-27 disclose the details of the connection properties that may be modified for each one of the tabs shown in Fig. 7);

receiving a user selection of an active area of the desktop (Fig. 6 that further shows a "New Connector" active area on the desktop **window** to define a new connection; column 6, lines 29-38 describe the same details);

wherein the user selection of the active area allows a second connection icon to be displayed directly on the desktop, wherein the second connection icon represents a second connection different than the first connection (Fig. 6 that shows a second connection "Work From Home" icon, connecting a client's computer/laptop at home with the server on the Office LAN network, which is different than a first connection (shown as "Office" in Fig. 6)).

However, Falcon et al. do not specifically disclose that the first connection icon is for a first application and the second connection icon is for a second application; **and displaying at least a first application icon on the desktop at the remote computing**

device, wherein the first application icon represents an application available for execution on the first local computing device.

In the same field of endeavor, Coulthard et al. show and disclose the claimed method, wherein a first connection is for a first application and the second connection is for a second application, ***and displaying at least a first application icon on the desktop at the remote computing device, wherein the first application icon represents an application available for execution on the first local computing device*** (Fig. 11, that shows three different connections 1111-1113 between a Developer 1 and three Remote Systems 1120, 1122 and 1124, wherein connection 1111 **(the first connection)** provides access to Tool A (application 1130) **to be executed on the “Remote System 1”, i.e. 1120 (corresponding to the first local computing device, a first server)** and connection 1112 **(the second connection)** provides access to Tool C (application 1150) **to be executed on the “Remote System 2”, i.e. 1122 (corresponding to the second local computing device, a second server)**; paragraph 0099 describes the same details).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to provide a method, wherein a first connection is for a first application and the second connection is for a second application, and displaying at least a first application icon on the desktop at the remote computing device, wherein the first application icon represents an application available for execution on the first local computing device, as taught by Coulthard et al., in the method of Falcon et al., so as to

provide a user a graphical interface to set up and manage network connections based on the needed applications.

Although the combined references of Falcon et al. and Coulthard et al. disclose each and every element of claim 1; the applicants have argued that having a connection icon on a desktop is not equivalent to having a connection icon in a window which is displayed on a desktop. Although dragging and dropping an icon from a displayed window to a desktop is a common and obvious technique in a Windows operating system, the examiner has included the additional reference of Handel et al. specifically to show that placing a connection icon on a desktop has indeed been previously disclosed, as described in column 30, lines 24-32 of the Handel et al. reference.

Consider **claim 17**, Falcon et al. disclose a computer-executable program code stored on a computer readable medium for managing a connection between a local computing device and a remote computing device using a user interface (claim 11; Fig. 6 that shows a user interface for setting up network and Internet connections; Fig. 7 that shows a second interface to manage connections by setting different configuration options for a connection; column 2, lines 7-9 disclose the same details), the computer-executable program code comprising:
code for displaying a desktop **at the remote computing device** (Fig. 6 that displays a desktop with a user interface for setting up network and Internet connections **at the remote computing device**);

code for displaying at least a first connection icon directly on the desktop, the first connection icon representing a first connection between the remote computing device and a first local computing device (Fig. 6 that shows a **window over** a desktop with a plurality of connection icons named "Office", "Work From Home" and "MSN" to select from, wherein each connection icon (under the "Connector Name" heading) represents a connection between a server (a first local computing device) and a client/user computer (the remote computing device); column 6, lines 29-43 describe the connection interface in more details);

code for receiving a user selection of the first connection icon, wherein the user selection of the first connection icon allows a first connection represented by the first connection icon to become modifiable to alter the first connection (Fig. 7 that shows a user interface for receiving configuration information from a user for a selected connection (e.g. configuration information for the "Office" connection shown in Fig. 6); further showing different tabs that allow a user to modify the configuration settings of the selected connection; column 7, lines 1-27 disclose the details of the connection properties that may be modified for each one of the tabs shown in Fig. 7);

code for receiving a user selection of an active area of the desktop (Fig. 6 that further shows a "New Connector" active area on the desktop to define a new connection; column 6, lines 29-38 describe the same details),

wherein the user selection of the active area allows a second connection icon to be displayed directly on the desktop (Fig. 6 that shows three different connections on the

desktop **window** that were created by the new connection wizard, then displayed as icons on the desktop **window**; column 6, lines 29-34 describe the same details), wherein the second connection icon represents a second connection different than the first connection (Fig. 6 that shows a first connection "Office" icon, connecting a client's computer/workstation with the server on an office LAN, and a second connection "Work From Home" icon, connecting a client's computer/laptop at home with the server on the Office LAN network).

However, Falcon et al. do not specifically disclose that the first connection icon is for a first application and the second connection icon is for a second application, **and code for displaying at least a first application icon on the desktop at the remote computing device, wherein the first application icon represents an application available for execution on the first local computing device.**

In the same field of endeavor, Coulthard et al. show and disclose the claimed computer-executable program code, wherein a first connection is for a first application and the second connection is for a second application, **and code for displaying at least a first application icon on the desktop at the remote computing device, wherein the first application icon represents an application available for execution on the first local computing device** (Fig. 11, that shows three different connections 1111-1113 between a Developer 1 and three Remote Systems 1120, 1122 and 1124, wherein connection 1111 **(the first connection)** provides access to Tool A (application 1130) **to be executed on the "Remote System 1", i.e. 1120 (corresponding to the first local computing device, a first server)** and connection

1112 (the second connection) provides access to Tool C (application 1150) to be executed on the “Remote System 2”, i.e. 1122 (corresponding to the second local computing device, a second server); paragraph 0099 describes the same details).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to provide a computer-executable program code stored on a computer-readable medium, wherein a first connection is for a first application and the second connection is for a second application, and code for displaying at least a first application icon on the desktop at the remote computing device, wherein the first application icon represents an application available for execution on the first local computing device, as taught by Coulthard et al., in the computer-executable program code of Falcon et al., so as to provide a user with the executable program code to set up and manage network connections based on the needed applications.

Although the combined references of Falcon et al. and Coulthard et al. disclose each and every element of claim 1; the applicants have argued that having a connection icon on a desktop is not equivalent to having a connection icon in a window which is displayed on a desktop. Although dragging and dropping an icon from a displayed window to a desktop is a common and obvious technique in a Windows operating system, the examiner has included the additional reference of Handel et al. specifically to show that placing a connection icon on a desktop has indeed been previously disclosed, as described in column 30, lines 24-32 of the Handel et al. reference.

Consider **claim 21**, Falcon et al. show and disclose a programmed computer apparatus for managing a connection between a local computing device and a remote computing device using a user interface (Fig. 6 that shows a computer desktop with a user interface for setting up network and Internet connections; Fig. 7 that shows a computer desktop with a user interface to manage connections by setting different configuration options for a connection; column 2, lines 7-9 disclose the same details), said programmed computer apparatus comprising:

means for displaying a desktop **at the remote computing device** (Fig. 6 that displays a computer desktop with a user interface for setting up network and Internet connections **at the remote computing device**),

means for displaying at least a first connection icon directly on the desktop, the first connection icon representing a first connection between the remote computing device and a first local computing device (Fig. 6 that shows a **window over** a desktop on a computer with a plurality of connection icons named "Office", "Work From Home" and "MSN" to select from, wherein each connection icon (under the "Connector Name" heading) represents a connection between a server (a first local computing device) and a client/user computer (the remote computing device); column 6, lines 29-43 describe the claimed apparatus in more details);

means for receiving a user selection of the first connection icon, wherein the user selection of the first connection icon allows a first connection represented by the first connection icon to become modifiable to alter the first connection (Fig. 7 that shows a user interface for receiving configuration information from a user for a selected

connection (e.g. configuration information for the "Office" connection shown in Fig. 6); further showing different tabs that allow a user to modify the configuration settings of the selected connection; column 7, lines 1-27 disclose the details of the connection properties that may be modified for each one of the tabs shown in Fig. 7); means for receiving a user selection of an active area of the desktop, wherein the user selection of the active area allows a second connection icon for a second application to be displayed directly on the desktop (Fig. 6 that shows a "New Connector" active area on the desktop **window** to define a new connection; Fig. 6 further shows three different connections on the desktop **window** that were created by the new connection wizard, then displayed as icons on the desktop **window**; column 6, lines 29-38 describe the same details); wherein the second connection icon represents a second connection different than the first connection (Fig. 6 that shows a first connection "Office" icon, connecting a client's computer/workstation with the server on an office LAN, and a second connection "Work From Home" icon, connecting a client's computer/laptop at home with the server on the Office LAN network).

However, Falcon et al. do not specifically disclose that the first connection icon is for a first application and the second connection icon is for a second application, ***and means for displaying at least a first application icon on the desktop at the remote computing device, wherein the first application icon represents an application available for execution on the first local computing device.***

In the same field of endeavor, Coulthard et al. show and disclose the claimed programmed computer apparatus, wherein a first connection is for a first application and the second connection is for a second application, ***and means for displaying at least a first application icon on the desktop at the remote computing device, wherein the first application icon represents an application available for execution on the first local computing device*** (Fig. 11, that shows three different connections 1111-1113 between a Developer 1 and three Remote Systems 1120, 1122 and 1124, wherein connection 1111 (**the first connection**) provides access to Tool A (application 1130) **to be executed on the “Remote System 1”, i.e. 1120 (corresponding to the first local computing device, a first server)** and connection 1112 (**the second connection**) provides access to Tool C (application 1150) **to be executed on the “Remote System 2”, i.e. 1122 (corresponding to the second local computing device, a second server)**; paragraph 0099 describes the same details).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to provide a programmed computer apparatus, wherein a first connection is for a first application and the second connection is for a second application, and means for displaying at least a first application icon on the desktop at the remote computing device, wherein the first application icon represents an application available for execution on the first local computing device, as taught by Coulthard et al., in the programmed computer apparatus of Falcon et al., so as to provide a user an apparatus to set up and manage network connections based on the needed applications.

Although the combined references of Falcon et al. and Coulthard et al. disclose each and every element of claim 1; the applicants have argued that having a connection icon on a desktop is not equivalent to having a connection icon in a window which is displayed on a desktop. Although dragging and dropping an icon from a displayed window to a desktop is a common and obvious technique in a Windows operating system, the examiner has included the additional reference of Handel et al. specifically to show that placing a connection icon on a desktop has indeed been previously disclosed, as described in column 30, lines 24-32 of the Handel et al. reference.

Claims 3, 9, 19 and 23 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Falcon et al. (U.S. Patent Publication # 6,295,556 B1) in view of Coulthard et al. (U.S. Patent Application Publication # 2004/0003371 A1) and further in view of Handel et al. (U.S. Patent Publication # 7,076,504 B1) and further in view of Perholtz et al. (U.S. Patent Application Publication # 2002/0091850 A1).

Consider **claim 3**, and **as it applies to claim 1 above**, Falcon et al., as modified by Coulthard et al. and Handel et al., show and disclose a user interface for managing a connection between a remote computing device and a local computing device, except further comprising a keystroke management window, wherein the keystroke management window is user modifiable to accept a local keystroke management setting, wherein if the local keystroke management setting is enabled, a keystroke is

processed at the remote computing device, and wherein if the local keystroke management setting is disabled, the keystroke is processed at the first local computing device.

In the same field of endeavor, Perholtz et al. disclose a user interface, further comprising a keystroke management window, wherein the keystroke management is user modifiable to accept a local keystroke management setting, wherein if the local keystroke management setting is enabled, a keystroke is processed at the remote computing device, and wherein if the local keystroke management setting is disabled, the keystroke is processed at the first local computing device (Flowchart of Fig. 7G, decision block 759 that checks for use of "Hot Keys"; paragraph 0288, lines 1-16 that disclose the use of "Hot Keys" for redirecting remote client's input keystrokes/mouse data to the local server and means to return back to the remote client's normal mode of operation by tapping the left shift key three times within 2 seconds; although no window is shown for selecting an option to make hot key sequences effective either at a local computing device or at a remote computing device, the paragraph does mention selecting from a menu, either Remote PC mode or Host mode. Based on the user selection, the hot keys are either applicable at the remote computing device, or at the local computing device. Therefore, the examiner has taken the official notice that the use of keystrokes achieves the same purpose as the mouse clicks on a GUI interface, as is evident when copying a paragraph from one document and pasting it into another document. One may use Ctrl-c keyboard keys to copy a selected paragraph or use a pulldown menu (GUI) or a toolbar icon to copy the paragraph).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to provide a user interface, further comprising a keystroke management window, wherein the keystroke management is user modifiable to accept a local keystroke management setting, wherein if the local keystroke management setting is enabled, a keystroke is processed at the remote computing device, and wherein if the local keystroke management setting is disabled, the keystroke is processed at the first local computing device, as taught by Perholtz et al., in the user interface of Falcon et al., as modified by Coulthard et al. and Handel et al., so as to provide a user ability to use hot keys to execute applications at the local computing device as well as at the remote computing device, and be able to easily switch between them.

Consider **claim 9**, and **as it applies to claim 7 above**, Falcon et al., as modified by Coulthard et al. and Handel et al., show and disclose the claimed method for managing a connection between a remote computing device and a local computing device, except further comprising the step of displaying a keystroke management window, wherein the keystroke management window is user modifiable to accept a local keystroke management setting, wherein if the local keystroke management setting is enabled, a keystroke is processed at the remote computing device, and wherein if the local keystroke management setting is disabled, the keystroke is processed at the first local computing device.

In the same field of endeavor, Perholtz et al. disclose the claimed method, further comprising the step of displaying a keystroke management window, wherein the keystroke management window is user modifiable to accept a local keystroke management setting, wherein if the local keystroke management setting is enabled, a keystroke is processed at the remote computing device, and wherein if the local keystroke management setting is disabled, the keystroke is processed at the first local computing device (Flowchart of Fig. 7G, decision block 759 that checks for use of "Hot Keys"; paragraph 0288, lines 1-16 that disclose the use of "Hot Keys" for redirecting remote client's input keystrokes/mouse data to the local server and means to return back to the remote client's normal mode of operation by tapping the left shift key three times within 2 seconds; although no window is shown for selecting an option to make hot key sequences effective either at a local computing device or at a remote computing device, the paragraph does mention selecting from a menu, either Remote PC mode or Host mode. Based on the user selection, the hot keys are either applicable at the remote computing device, or at the local computing device. Therefore, the examiner has taken the official notice that the use of keystrokes achieves the same purpose as the mouse clicks on a GUI interface, as is evident when copying a paragraph from one document and pasting it into another document. One may use Ctrl-c keyboard keys to copy a selected paragraph or use a pulldown menu (GUI) or a toolbar icon to copy the paragraph).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to provide a method, further comprising the step of

Art Unit: 2443

displaying a keystroke management window, wherein the keystroke management window is user modifiable to accept a local keystroke management setting, wherein if the local keystroke management setting is enabled, a keystroke is processed at the remote computing device, and wherein if the local keystroke management setting is disabled, the keystroke is processed at the first local computing device, as taught by Perholtz et al., in the method of Falcon et al., as modified by Coulthard et al. and Handel et al., so as to provide a user ability to use hot keys to execute applications at the local computing device as well as at the remote computing device, and be able to easily switch between them.

Consider **claim 19**, and **as it applies to claim 17 above**, Falcon et al., as modified by Coulthard et al. and Handel et al., show and disclose the claimed computer-executable program code, except code for displaying a keystroke management window, wherein the keystroke management window is user modifiable to accept a local keystroke management setting, wherein if the local keystroke management setting is enabled, a keystroke is processed at the remote computing device, and wherein if the local keystroke management setting is disabled, the keystroke is processed at the first local computing device.

In the same field of endeavor, Perholtz et al. disclose the claimed computer-executable program code, comprising code for displaying a keystroke management window, wherein the keystroke management window is user modifiable to accept a local keystroke management setting, wherein if the local keystroke management setting is

enabled, a keystroke is processed at the remote computing device, and wherein if the local keystroke management setting is disabled, the keystroke is processed at the first local computing device (Claims 1-5; Flowchart of Fig. 7G, decision block 759 that checks for use of "Hot Keys"; paragraph 0288, lines 1-16 that disclose the use of "Hot Keys" for redirecting remote client's input keystrokes/mouse data to the local server and means to return back to the remote client's normal mode of operation by tapping the left shift key three times within 2 seconds; although no window is shown for selecting an option to make hot key sequences effective either at a local computing device or at a remote computing device, the paragraph does mention selecting from a menu, either Remote PC mode or Host mode. Based on the user selection, the hot keys are either applicable at the remote computing device, or at the local computing device. Therefore, the examiner has taken the official notice that the use of keystrokes achieves the same purpose as the mouse clicks on a GUI interface, as is evident when copying a paragraph from one document and pasting it into another document. One may use Ctrl-c keyboard keys to copy a selected paragraph or use a pulldown menu (GUI) or a toolbar icon to copy the paragraph).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to provide a computer-executable program code, comprising code for displaying a keystroke management window, wherein the keystroke management window is user modifiable to accept a local keystroke management setting, wherein if the local keystroke management setting is enabled, a keystroke is processed at the remote computing device, and wherein if the local keystroke

management setting is disabled, the keystroke is processed at the first local computing device, as taught by Perholtz et al., in the computer-executable program code of Falcon et al., as modified by Coulthard et al. and Handel et al., so as to provide a user ability to use hot keys to execute applications at the local computing device as well as at the remote computing device, and be able to easily switch between them.

Consider **claim 23**, and **as it applies to claim 21 above**, Falcon et al., as modified by Coulthard et al., Handel et al., and Perholtz et al., further show and disclose a programmed computer apparatus for managing a connection between a local computing device and a remote computing device using a user interface, comprising means for displaying a keystroke management window, wherein the keystroke management window is user modifiable to accept a local keystroke management setting, wherein if the local keystroke management setting is enabled, a keystroke is processed at the remote computing device, and wherein if the local keystroke management setting is disabled, the keystroke is processed at the first local computing device (Flowchart of Fig. 7G, decision block 759 that checks for use of "Hot Keys"; paragraph 0288, lines 1-16 that disclose the use of "Hot Keys" for redirecting remote client's input keystrokes/mouse data to the local server and means to return back to the remote client's normal mode of operation by tapping the left shift key three times within 2 seconds; although no window is shown for selecting an option to make hot key sequences effective either at a local computing device or at a remote computing device, the paragraph does mention selecting from a menu, either Remote PC mode or Host

mode. Based on the user selection, the hot keys are either applicable at the remote computing device, or at the local computing device. Therefore, the examiner has taken the official notice that the use of keystrokes achieves the same purpose as the mouse clicks on a GUI interface, as is evident when copying a paragraph from one document and pasting it into another document. One may use Ctrl-c keyboard keys to copy a selected paragraph or use a pull-down menu (GUI) or a toolbar icon to copy the paragraph).

Claims 4, 10, 25, 27, 28 and 31 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over **Falcon et al. (U.S. Patent Publication # 6,295,556 B1)** in view of **Coulthard et al. (U.S. Patent Application Publication # 2004/0003371 A1)** and further in view of **Handel et al. (U.S. Patent Publication # 7,076,504 B1)** and further in view of **Beadle et al. (U.S. Patent Publication # 7,039,709 B1)**.

Consider **claim 4**, and **as it applies to claim 1 above**, Falcon et al., as modified by Coulthard et al. and Handel et al., disclose the claimed user interface, except wherein the first connection icon and the second connection icon each includes a priority.

In the same field of endeavor, Beadle et al. disclose a user interface for managing a connection between a remote computing device and a local computing device, wherein the first connection icon and the second connection icon each includes a priority (in Beadle et al. reference, Fig. 5A, "Select Default Server" block 507,

"Override Defaults" block 511, and "Update Settings" button 515 that enable a user to set priorities in selecting different connections and other options; Fig. 6A that lists some of the options 601 that can be assigned priority values to arrive at the relative ratings 605; column 8, lines 28-33 that disclose the same details).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to provide a user interface, wherein the first connection icon and the second connection icon each includes a priority, as taught by Beadle et al., in the user interface of Falcon et al., as modified by Coulthard et al. and Handel et al., so as to allow users to assign different priorities to defined connections.

Consider **claim 10**, and **as it applies to claim 7 above**, Falcon et al., as modified by Coulthard et al. and Handel et al., disclose the claimed method, except wherein the first connection icon and the second connection icon each includes a priority.

In the same field of endeavor, Beadle et al. disclose a method for managing a connection between a local computing device and a remote computing device, using a user interface, wherein the first connection icon and the second connection icon each includes a priority (in Beadle et al. reference, Fig. 5A, "Select Default Server" block 507, "Override Defaults" block 511, and "Update Settings" button 515 that enable a user to set priorities in selecting different connections and other options; Fig. 6A that lists some of the options 601 that can be assigned priority values to arrive at the relative ratings 605; column 8, lines 28-33 that disclose the same details).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to provide a method for a user interface, wherein the first connection icon and the second connection icon each includes a priority, as taught by Beadle et al., in the method of Falcon et al., as modified by Coulthard et al. and Handel et al., so as to allow users to assign different priorities to defined connections.

Consider **claim 25**, and **as it applies to claim 1 above**, Falcon et al., as modified by Coulthard et al. and Handel et al., further disclose the claimed user interface for managing a connection between a remote computing device and a local computing device, wherein selecting the first connection icon allows the user to edit or delete the first connection (in Falcon et al. reference, Fig. 7 which shows a second interface to manage connections by setting different configuration options for a connection; column 2, lines 7-9 disclose the same details).

However, Falcon et al., as modified by Coulthard et al. and Handel et al., do not specifically disclose the user interface wherein the remote computing device is a thin client, and wherein the user interface is to be displayed at the thin client.

In the same field of endeavor, Beadle et al. disclose the claimed user interface for managing a connection between a remote computing device and a local computing device, wherein the remote computing device is a thin client (column 1, lines 32-34 which disclose that clients can be “dumber” systems (thin clients) adapted for limited use with a network); and

wherein the user interface is to be displayed at the thin client (column 2, lines 54-57 that disclose a graphical user interface for receiving user selection at the remote thin client, and a connection utility for connecting the client with a selected local server).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to provide a user interface, wherein the remote computing device is a thin client, and wherein the user interface is to be displayed at the thin client, as taught by Beadle et al., in the user interface of Falcon et al., as modified by Coulthard et al. and Handel et al., so as to provide support for connection management to clients with thin remote devices.

Consider **claim 27**, and **as it applies to claim 17 above**, Falcon et al., as modified by Coulthard et al. and Handel et al., disclose the claimed computer-executable program code, wherein selecting the first connection icon allows the user to edit or delete the first connection (in Falcon et al. reference, Fig. 7 which shows a second interface to manage connections by setting different configuration options for a connection; column 2, lines 7-9 disclose the same details); and wherein the first application is different from the second application (in Coulthard et al. reference, Fig. 11, that shows three different connections 1111-1113 between a Developer 1 and three Remote Systems 1120, 1122 and 1124, wherein connection 1111 provides access to Tool A (application 1130) and connection 1112 provides access to Tool C (application 1150); paragraph 0099 describes the same details).

However, Falcon et al., as modified by Coulthard et al. and Handel et al., do not specifically disclose that the remote computing device is a thin client, wherein the user interface is to be displayed at the thin client, and wherein the second connection is between the thin client and a second local computing device.

In the same field of endeavor, Beadle et al. disclose the claimed computer-executable program code for managing a connection between a remote computing device and a local computing device, wherein the remote computing device is a thin client (column 1, lines 32-34 which disclose that clients can be "dumber" systems (thin clients) adapted for limited use with a network); wherein the user interface is to be displayed at the thin client (column 2, lines 54-57 that disclose a graphical user interface for receiving user selection at the remote thin client, and a connection utility for connecting the client with a selected local server); and wherein the second connection is between the thin client and a second local computing device (Fig. 10 that shows a second connection using modem transmission; column 10, lines 6-24 which disclose a first connection via satellite to a DirectPC application and a second modem connection to a server for a financial application).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to provide computer-executable program code, wherein the remote computing device is a thin client, wherein the user interface is to be displayed at the thin client, and wherein the second connection is between the thin client and a second local computing device, as taught by Beadle et al., in the computer-executable program code of Falcon et al., as modified by Coulthard et al. and Handel et

al., so as to provide support for connection management to clients with thin remote devices.

Consider **claim 28**, and **as it applies to claim 21 above**, Falcon et al., as modified by Coulthard et al. and Handel et al., disclose the claimed programmed computer apparatus, wherein the user selection of the first connection icon allows a user at the thin client to edit or delete the first connection (in Falcon et al. reference, Fig. 7 which shows a second interface to manage connections by setting different configuration options for a connection; column 2, lines 7-9 disclose the same details); and wherein the first application is different from the second application (in Coulthard et al. reference, Fig. 11, that shows three different connections 1111-1113 between a Developer 1 and three Remote Systems 1120, 1122 and 1124, wherein connection 1111 provides access to Tool A (application 1130) and connection 1112 provides access to Tool C (application 1150); paragraph 0099 describes the same details).

However, Falcon et al., as modified by Coulthard et al. and Handel et al., do not specifically disclose that the remote computing device is a thin client, wherein the user interface is to be displayed at the thin client, wherein the active area is an empty area, and wherein the second connection is between the thin client and a second local computing device.

In the same field of endeavor, Beadle et al., disclose the claimed programmed computer apparatus, wherein the remote computing device is a thin client (in Beadle et

al. reference, claims 10-12; column 1, lines 32-34 which disclose that clients can be "dumber" systems (thin clients) adapted for limited use with a network); wherein the user interface is to be displayed at the thin client (column 2, lines 54-57 that disclose a graphical user interface for receiving user selection at the remote thin client, and a connection utility for connecting the client with a selected local server); wherein the active area is an empty area (in Beadle et al. reference, Fig. 5A, desktop area 507, 511 or 513 that does not include the first connection areas 505A-D (this interpretation of empty area based on the applicants' definition of empty area in paragraph 0075 of the application stating that empty area is where desktop is not displaying first connection)); and wherein the second connection is between the thin client and a second local computing device (in Beadle et al. reference, Fig. 10 that shows a second connection using modem transmission; column 10, lines 6-24 which disclose a first connection via satellite to a DirectPC application and a second modem connection to a server for a financial application).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to provide a programmed computer apparatus, wherein the remote computing device is a thin client, wherein the user interface is to be displayed at the thin client, wherein the active area is an empty area, and wherein the second connection is between the thin client and a second local computing device, as taught by Beadle et al., in the programmed computer apparatus of Falcon et al., as

modified by Coulthard et al. and Handel et al., so as to provide support for connection management to clients with thin remote devices.

Consider **claim 31**, and **as it applies to claim 17 above**, Falcon et al., as modified by Coulthard et al. and Handel et al., disclose the claimed computer-executable program code, except wherein the first connection icon and the second connection icon each includes a priority.

In the same field of endeavor, Beadle et al. disclose computer-executable program code, wherein the first connection icon and the second connection icon each includes a priority (in Beadle et al. reference, claims 10-12; Fig. 5A, "Select Default Server" block 507, "Override Defaults" block 511, and "Update Settings" button 515 that enable a user to set priorities in selecting different connections and other options; Fig. 6A that lists some of the options 601 that can be assigned priority values to arrive at the relative ratings 605; column 8, lines 28-33 that disclose the same details).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to provide computer-executable program code, wherein the first connection icon and the second connection icon each includes a priority, as taught by Beadle et al., in the computer-executable program code of Falcon et al., as modified by Coulthard et al. and Handel et al., so as to allow users to assign different priorities to defined connections.

Claim 5 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over **Falcon et al. (U.S. Patent Publication # 6,295,556 B1)** in view of **Coulthard et al. (U.S. Patent Application Publication # 2004/0003371 A1)** and further in view of **Handel et al. (U.S. Patent Publication # 7,076,504 B1)** and further in view of **Lele (U.S. Patent Publication # 7,181,524 B1)**.

Consider **claim 5**, and **as it applies to claim 1 above**, Falcon et al., as modified by Coulthard et al. and Handel et al., disclose the claimed user interface, except wherein the priority is a failover order.

In the same field of endeavor, Lele discloses a user interface, wherein the priority is a failover order (column 1, lines 21-27 that disclose a plurality of servers connected in a server cluster to provide failover redundancy; Fig. 1, Rules block 154 and Selection Algorithm block 155 that specify server selection criteria; thereby disclosing server failover order that a user may specify as a priority option in the connection management).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to provide a user interface for managing a connection between a remote computing device and a local computing device, wherein the priority is a failover order, as taught by Lele, in the user interface of Falcon et al., as modified by Coulthard et al. and Handel et al., so as to provide an alternate connection path to a server, in case the selected server fails.

Claims 6, 12, 20 and 24 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over **Falcon et al. (U.S. Patent Publication # 6,295,556 B1)** in view of **Coulthard et al. (U.S. Patent Application Publication # 2004/0003371 A1)** and further in view of **Handel et al. (U.S. Patent Publication # 7,076,504 B1)** and further in view of **Ritchy et al. (U.S. Patent Application Publication # 2004/0183831 A1)**.

Consider **claim 6**, and **as it applies to claim 1 above**, Falcon et al., as modified by Coulthard et al. and Handel et al., disclose the claimed user interface, except further comprising a desktop shell window, wherein the desktop shell window is modifiable at run-time by the user at the remote computing device to accept a desktop shell setting, wherein if the desktop shell setting is disabled, an alternate user interface is selected and the user interface is disabled.

In the same field of endeavor, Ritchy et al. disclose a desktop window, wherein the desktop shell window is modifiable at run-time by the user at the remote computing device to accept a desktop shell setting, wherein if the desktop shell setting is disabled, an alternate user interface is selected and the user interface is disabled (Fig. 9 that shows a default desktop window and a pull-down to select alternate desktop shell if the user so desires; paragraph 0049, lines 9-11 which disclose that different shells for the desktop are selectable in the Property Editor window, and portal administrators and end users can also change a desktop's shell, thereby disclosing that the desktop shell window is modifiable at run-time by the user at the remote computing device to accept a

desktop shell setting; wherein if the desktop shell setting is disabled, an alternate user interface is selected and the user interface is disabled).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to provide a desktop shell window, wherein the desktop shell window is modifiable at run-time by the user at the remote computing device to accept a desktop shell setting, wherein if the desktop shell setting is disabled, an alternate user interface is selected and the user interface is disabled, as taught by Ritchy et al., in the user interface of Falcon et al., as modified by Coulthard et al. and Handel et al., so as to provide multiple operating systems environments for the user to choose from, based on user's preferences, on the same desktop.

Consider **claim 12**, and **as it applies to claim 7 above**, Falcon et al., as modified by Coulthard et al. and Handel et al., disclose the claimed method, except further comprising the steps of displaying a desktop shell window, wherein the desktop shell window is modifiable at run-time by a user at the remote computing device to accept a desktop shell setting; selecting an alternate user interface, if the desktop shell setting is disabled; disabling the user interface, if the desktop shell setting is disabled.

In the same field of endeavor, Ritchy et al. disclose a desktop window, wherein the desktop shell window is modifiable at run-time by a user at the remote computing device to accept a desktop shell setting; selecting an alternate user interface, if the desktop shell setting is disabled; disabling the user interface, if the desktop shell setting is disabled (Fig. 9 that shows a default desktop window and a pull-down to select

alternate desktop shell if the user so desires; paragraph 0049, lines 9-11 which disclose that different shells for the desktop are selectable in the Property Editor window, and portal administrators and end users can also change a desktop's shell, thereby disclosing that the desktop shell window is modifiable at run time by the user at the remote computing device to accept a desktop shell setting, selecting an alternate user interface, if the desktop shell setting is disabled, and disabling the user interface, if the desktop shell setting is disabled).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to provide a desktop shell window, wherein the desktop shell window is modifiable at run-time by a user at the remote computing device to accept a desktop shell setting; selecting an alternate user interface, if the desktop shell setting is disabled; disabling the user interface, if the desktop shell setting is disabled, as taught by Ritchy et al., in the method of Falcon et al., as modified by Coulthard et al. and Handel et al., so as to provide multiple operating systems environments for the user to choose from, based on user's preferences, on the same desktop.

Consider **claim 20**, and **as it applies to claim 17 above**, Falcon et al., as modified by Coulthard et al. and Handel et al., disclose the claimed computer-executable program code, except said program code comprising code for displaying a desktop shell window, wherein the desktop shell window is modifiable at run-time by a user at the remote computing device to accept a desktop shell setting; code for

selecting an alternate user interface, if the desktop shell setting is disabled; and code for disabling the user interface, if the desktop shell setting is disabled.

In the same field of endeavor, Ritchy et al. disclose a computer-readable storage medium with stored program code, said program comprising code for permitting the computer to perform a step for displaying a desktop shell window, wherein the desktop shell window is modifiable at run-time by a user at the remote computing device to accept a desktop shell setting; a selecting step for selecting an alternate user interface, if the desktop shell setting is disabled; a disabling step for disabling the user interface, if the desktop shell setting is disabled (Claims 20-38, 60-80, and 101-120; that shows a default desktop window with a user interface (pull-down) to select an alternate desktop shell if the user so desires; paragraph 0049, lines 9-11 which disclose that different shells for the desktop are selectable in the Property Editor window, and portal administrators and end users can also change a desktop's shell, thereby disclosing that the desktop shell window is modifiable at run-time by a user at the remote computing device to accept a desktop shell setting, selecting an alternate user interface, if the desktop shell setting is disabled, and disabling the user interface, if the desktop shell setting is disabled).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to provide a computer-readable storage medium with stored program code for managing a connection between a local computing device and a remote computing device, said program comprising code for permitting the computer to perform a step for displaying a desktop shell window, wherein the desktop shell

window is modifiable at run-time by a user at the remote computing device to accept a desktop shell setting; a selecting step for selecting an alternate user interface, if the desktop shell setting is disabled; a disabling step for disabling the user interface, if the desktop shell setting is disabled, as taught by Ritchy et al., in the computer-executable program code of Falcon et al., as modified by Coulthard et al. and Handel et al., so as to provide a user ability to select any one of the many available desktop shells that is most suited to the user.

Consider **claim 24**, and **as it applies to claim 21 above**, Falcon et al., as modified by Coulthard et al. and Handel et al., show and disclose the claimed programmed computer apparatus, except further comprising means for displaying a desktop shell window, wherein the desktop shell window is modifiable at run-time by a user at the remote computing device; means for selecting an alternate user interface, if the desktop shell setting is disabled; and means for disabling the user interface, if the desktop shell setting is disabled.

In the same field of endeavor, Ritchy et al. show and disclose the claimed programmed computer apparatus, further comprising means for displaying a desktop shell window, wherein the desktop shell window is modifiable at run time by a user at the remote computing device; means for selecting an alternate user interface, if the desktop shell setting is disabled; and means for disabling the user interface, if the desktop shell setting is disabled (Fig. 9 that shows a default desktop window and a pull-down to select alternate desktop shell if the user so desires; paragraph 0049, lines 9-11

which disclose that different shells for the desktop are selectable in the Property Editor window, and portal administrators and end users can also change a desktop's shell, thereby disclosing that the desktop shell window is modifiable at run-time by the user at the remote computing device to accept a desktop shell setting, selecting an alternate user interface, if the desktop shell setting is disabled, and disabling the improved user interface, if the desktop shell setting is disabled).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to provide means for displaying a desktop shell window, wherein the desktop shell window is modifiable at run time by a user at the remote computing device; means for selecting an alternate user interface, if the desktop shell setting is disabled; and means for disabling the user interface, if the desktop shell setting is disabled, as taught by Ritchy et al., in the programmed computer apparatus of Falcon et al., as modified by Coulthard et al. and Handel et al., so as to provide a user ability to select any one of the many available desktop shells that is most suited to the user.

Claims 11 and 32 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over **Falcon et al. (U.S. Patent Publication # 6,295,556 B1)** in view of **Coulthard et al. (U.S. Patent Application Publication # 2004/0003371 A1)** and further in view of **Handel et al. (U.S. Patent Publication # 7,076,504 B1)** and further in view of **Beadle et al. (U.S. Patent Publication # 7,039,709 B1)** and further in view of **Lele (U.S. Patent Publication # 7,181,524 B1)**.

Consider **claim 11**, and **as it applies to claim 10 above**, Falcon et al., as modified by Coulthard et al., Handel et al., and Beadle et al., disclose the claimed method, except wherein the priority is a failover order.

In the same field of endeavor, Lele discloses the claimed method, wherein the priority is a failover order (column 1, lines 21-27 that disclose a plurality of servers connected in a server cluster to provide failover redundancy; Fig. 1, Rules block 154 and Selection Algorithm block 155 that specify server selection criteria; thereby disclosing server failover order that a user may specify as a priority option in the connection management).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to provide a method for managing a connection between a remote computing device and a local computing device using a user interface, wherein the priority is a failover order, as taught by Lele, in the method of Falcon et al., as modified by Coulthard et al., Handel et al., and Beadle et al., so as to provide an alternate connection path to a server, in case the selected server fails.

Consider **claim 32**, and **as it applies to claim 31 above**, Falcon et al., as modified by Coulthard et al., Handel et al., and Beadle et al., disclose the claimed computer-executable program code, except wherein the priority is a failover order.

In the same field of endeavor, Lele discloses the claimed computer-executable program code, wherein the priority is a failover order (column 1, lines 21-27 that

disclose a plurality of servers connected in a server cluster to provide failover redundancy; Fig. 1, Rules block 154 and Selection Algorithm block 155 that specify server selection criteria; thereby disclosing server failover order that a user may specify as a priority option in the connection management).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to provide computer-executable program code for managing a connection between a remote computing device and a local computing device, wherein the priority is a failover order, as taught by Lele, in the computer-executable program code of Falcon et al., as modified by Coulthard et al., Handel et al., and Beadle et al., so as to provide an alternate connection path to a server, in case the selected server fails.

Claims 26, 29 and 30 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over **Falcon et al. (U.S. Patent Publication # 6,295,556 B1)** in view of **Coulthard et al. (U.S. Patent Application Publication # 2004/0003371 A1)** and further in view of **Handel et al. (U.S. Patent Publication # 7,076,504 B1)** and further in view of **Beadle et al. (U.S. Patent Publication # 7,039,709 B1)** and further in view of **Muraca (U.S. Patent Application Publication # 2002/0055917 A1)**.

Consider **claim 26**, and **as it applies to claim 7 above**, Falcon et al., as modified by Coulthard et al., and Handel et al., further show and disclose the claimed method, wherein the user selection of the first connection icon allows a user to edit or

delete the first connection (in Falcon et al. reference, Fig. 7 which shows a second interface to manage (edit or modify) connections by setting different configuration options for a connection; column 2, lines 7-9 disclose the same details); and wherein the first application is different from the second application (in Coulthard et al. reference, Fig. 11, that shows three different connections 1111-1113 between a Developer 1 and three Remote Systems 1120, 1122 and 1124, wherein connection 1111 provides access to Tool A (application 1130) and connection 1112 provides access to Tool C (application 1150); paragraph 0099 describes the same details).

However, Falcon et al., as modified by Coulthard et al., and Handel et al., do not specifically disclose that the remote computing device is a thin client, wherein the user interface is to be displayed at the thin client, ***wherein the thin client's operating system is designed for generic remote computing devices***, and wherein the second connection is between the thin client and a second local computing device.

In the same field of endeavor, Beadle et al. disclose the claimed method, wherein the remote computing device is a thin client (in Beadle et al. reference, column 1, lines 32-34 which disclose that clients can be "dumber" systems (thin clients) adapted for limited use with a network); wherein the user interface is to be displayed at the thin client (in Beadle et al. reference, column 2, lines 54-57 that disclose a graphical user interface for receiving user selection at the remote thin client, and a connection utility for connecting the client with a selected local server); and

wherein the second connection is between the thin client and a second local computing device (in Beadle et al. reference, Fig. 10 that shows a second connection using modem transmission; column 10, lines 6-24 which disclose a first connection via satellite to a DirectPC application and a second modem connection to a server for a financial application).

However, Falcon et al., as modified by Coulthard et al., Handel et al., and Beadle et al., do not specifically disclose that ***the thin client's operating system is designed for generic remote computing devices.***

In the same field of endeavor, Muraca discloses the claimed method ***wherein the thin client's operating system is designed for generic remote computing devices*** (paragraphs 104 and 114 which disclose that thin clients such as PDA and Pocket PC use Windows CE operating system; paragraph 0197 which ***discloses streamlining the management and administration of access to external connections; Fig. 36 shows use of thin clients.***)

Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to provide a thin client with generic operating system, as taught by Muraca, in the method of Falcon et al., as modified by Coulthard et al., Handel et al., and Beadle et al., so as to support connection management for thin clients that need a portable operating system, such as Microsoft Windows CE operating system.

Consider **claim 29**, and **as it applies to claim 1 above**, Falcon et al., as modified by Coulthard et al. and Handel et al., show and disclose the claimed user interface, except wherein the remote computing device is a thin client, **and wherein the thin client's operating system is designed for generic remote computing devices.**

In the same field of endeavor, Beadle et al., show and disclose the claimed user interface, wherein the remote computing device is a thin client (column 1, lines 32-34 which disclose that clients can be "dumber" systems (thin clients) adapted for limited use with a network).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to provide the user interface for a thin client, as taught by Beadle et al., in the user interface of Falcon et al., as modified by Coulthard et al. and Handel et al., so as to support connection management for thin clients.

However, Falcon et al., as modified by Coulthard et al., Handel et al., and Beadle et al., do not specifically disclose that **the thin client's operating system is designed for generic remote computing devices.**

In the same field of endeavor, Muraca discloses the claimed user interface **wherein the thin client's operating system is designed for generic remote computing devices** (paragraphs 104 and 114 which disclose that thin clients such as PDA and Pocket PC use Windows CE operating system; paragraph 0197 which discloses streamlining the management and administration of access to external connections; Fig. 36 shows use of thin clients).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to provide a thin client with a generic operating system for remote computing devices, as taught by Muraca, in the user interface of Falcon et al., as modified by Coulthard et al., Handel et al., and Beadle et al., so as to support connection management for thin clients that need a portable operating system, such as Microsoft® Windows® CE operating system.

Consider **claim 30**, and **as it applies to claim 17 above**, Falcon et al., as modified by Coulthard et al. and Handel et al., disclose the claimed computer-executable program code, except wherein the remote computing device is a thin client, ***and wherein the thin client's operating system is designed for generic remote computing devices.***

In the same field of endeavor, Beadle et al., disclose the claimed computer-executable program code, wherein the remote computing device is a thin client (claims 10-12; column 1, lines 32-34 which disclose that clients can be "dumber" systems (thin clients) adapted for limited use with a network).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to provide the computer-executable program code for a thin client, as taught by Beadle et al., in the computer-executable program code of Falcon et al., as modified by Coulthard et al. and Handel et al., so as to support connection management for thin clients.

However, Falcon et al., as modified by Coulthard et al., Handel et al., and Beadle et al., do not specifically disclose that ***the thin client's operating system is designed for generic remote computing devices.***

In the same field of endeavor, Muraca discloses the claimed computer-executable program code ***wherein the thin client's operating system is designed for generic remote computing devices*** (claim 1; paragraphs 104 and 114 which disclose that thin clients such as PDA and Pocket PC use Windows CE operating system; paragraph 0197 which discloses streamlining the management and administration of access to external connections; Fig. 36 shows use of thin clients).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to provide a generic operating system for remote computing devices, as taught by Muraca, in the computer-executable program code of Falcon et al., as modified by Coulthard et al., Handel et al., and Beadle et al., so as to support connection management for thin clients that need a portable operating system, such as Microsoft® Windows® CE operating system.

Response to Arguments

Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1, 3-7, 9-12, 17, 19-21 and 23-32 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Conclusion

Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

Any response to this Office Action should be **faxed to (571) 273-8300 or mailed to:**

Commissioner for Patents
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

Art Unit: 2443

Hand-delivered responses should be brought to

Customer Service Window
Randolph Building
401 Dulany Street
Alexandria, VA 22314

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the Examiner should be directed to Kishin G. Belani whose telephone number is (571) 270-1768. The Examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Friday from 6:00 am to 5:00 pm.

If attempts to reach the Examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the Examiner's supervisor, Tonia Dollinger can be reached on (571) 272-4170. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is (571) 273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free) or 703-305-3028.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist/customer service whose telephone number is (571) 272-0800.

/K. G. B./
Examiner, Art Unit 2443

March 12, 2009

/George C Neurauter, Jr./
Primary Examiner, Art Unit 2443